

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Tyler Walls	Team: Squad #6	CCRB Case #: 202007454	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Tuesday, 11/10/2020 2:00 PM	Location of Incident: 84th Precinct Stationhouse	Precinct: 84	18 Mo. SOL 5/10/2022	EO SOL 5/10/2022	
Date/Time CV Reported Tue, 11/10/2020 4:12 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: On-line website	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 11/10/2020 4:12 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. SGT Peter Ahn	01234	948594	084 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Paulton Chan	15546	955807	084 PCT
2. POM Dennis Ferrer	02919	921334	084 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.SGT Peter Ahn	Abuse: Sergeant Peter Ahn refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)	

Case Summary

On November 10, 2021, § 87(2)(b) filed the following complaint via the CCRB's online website.

On November 10, 2021, at approximately 2:00 p.m., § 87(2)(b) went to the 84th Precinct stationhouse to file a fraud report. § 87(2)(b) spoke to several officers in the waiting area of the stationhouse, including PO Paulton Chan. PO Chan did not know how to categorize the complaint, so he went to the backroom and spoke with Sgt. Peter Ahn. When PO Chan returned, he explained that they could not take § 87(2)(b)'s complaint at the stationhouse. § 87(2)(b) asked to speak with Sgt. Ahn. Sgt. Ahn went out to the waiting area and started yelling at § 87(2)(b) that they could not take his complaint. As Sgt. Ahn was about to go back inside, § 87(2)(b) asked, "Can I at least have your name?" Sgt. Ahn did not respond and went back inside (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). § 87(2)(b) left the stationhouse without further incident.

The investigation obtained stationhouse video footage of the incident. No BWC was obtained because the incident did not require it to be activated.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Peter Ahn refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b).

Stationhouse video footage showed § 87(2)(b) speaking with PO Chan inside of the waiting area. At the 06:50 mark of the video, Sgt. Ahn came out of the backroom and stood by the doorway. Sgt. Ahn spoke with § 87(2)(b) and then headed back inside along with PO Chan. While this interaction happened, PO Dennis Ferrer left the backroom and started fiddling with his bag by the front desk. PO Ferrer went back inside shortly after. There were no other officers present during this conversation. Sometime later, PO Chan came back to the waiting area and spoke with § 87(2)(b) again. PO Chan handed § 87(2)(b) a piece of paper. § 87(2)(b) left the stationhouse and PO Chan went back inside. At no point in the video does a female officer sit at the front desk. The video does not have any audio (BR 01).

§ 87(2)(b) testified that on November 10, 2021, at approximately 2:00 p.m., he went into the 84th Precinct stationhouse to file a fraud report. § 87(2)(b) explained his situation to a female officer, PO1, who remains unidentified, sitting at the front desk in the waiting area, who then asked several different officers, including PO Chan, for advice on how to handle the complaint. PO Chan and PO1 went to the backroom to speak with Sgt. Ahn. When they returned, PO Chan and PO1 informed § 87(2)(b) that they could not take his complaint about the incident. § 87(2)(b) asked to speak with Sgt. Ahn. PO Chan went into the backroom and returned with Sgt. Ahn. Sgt. Ahn yelled at § 87(2)(b) that his complaint would need to be made in Long Beach, where he lived. As Sgt. Ahn left to go back inside, § 87(2)(b) asked, "Can I at least get your name?" Sgt. Ahn was approximately 20 feet away from § 87(2)(b) and by the doorway to the backroom when this request was made. Sgt. Ahn went into the backroom without responding or acknowledging § 87(2)(b)'s request. PO Chan and PO1 followed Sgt. Ahn inside. After approximately 15 minutes, PO Chan returned to the waiting area. § 87(2)(b) asked PO Chan for Sgt. Ahn's name. PO Chan verbally provided Sgt. Ahn's last name. § 87(2)(b) asked PO Chan for Sgt. Ahn's first name, but he stated that he could not provide it. PO Chan went into the backroom and § 87(2)(b) left the stationhouse shortly after (BR 02).

Sgt. Ahn testified that although he was assigned as a patrol supervisor for that day, he recalled speaking with § 87(2)(b) in the waiting area of the stationhouse. § 87(2)(b) informed Sgt. Ahn about the fraud complaint and Sgt. Ahn told § 87(2)(b) that he could not take his complaint and

how he can handle the complaint. Sgt. Ahn then went into the backroom. Sgt. Ahn did not recall if he was on desk duty or if § 87(2)(b) spoke with another officer before speaking with him. Sgt. Ahn could not recall if § 87(2)(b) requested his name but stated that he would have provided his name to § 87(2)(b) if he heard the request (BR 03).

PO Chan testified that he was the telephone/switchboard operator on that day and sat at the front desk inside of the waiting area during the incident. After speaking with § 87(2)(b) PO Chan verified his documents and went into the backroom to inform Sgt. Ahn. Sgt. Ahn told PO Chan that they could not take § 87(2)(b)'s complaint because the report needed to be filed where he resided. After relaying this information to § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) asked to speak with Sgt. Ahn. Sgt. Ahn came out of the backroom on his own and told § 87(2)(b) that he needed to file his report at the precinct where he lived. Sgt. Ahn and § 87(2)(b) stood approximately 10-15 feet away from each other while they talked. Towards the end of the conversation, Sgt. Ahn told § 87(2)(b) "My name is Sgt. Ahn." PO Chan did not recall if § 87(2)(b) asked for Sgt. Ahn's name beforehand nor could he recall if § 87(2)(b) requested Sgt. Ahn's name after he identified himself. Sgt. Ahn and PO Chan went back inside. PO Chan did not recall if he ever came back out to speak with § 87(2)(b) again (BR 04).

PO Ferrer did not recall any aspect of this incident because he was only in the waiting area briefly to take his temperature before going out on patrol (BR 05).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party (BR 06).
- Sgt. Ahn has been an MOS for 10 years and has been a subject in eight CCRB complaints and 15 allegations, of which one has been substantiated.
 - o CCRB case number 201607604 involved a substantiated allegation of threat of arrest against Sgt. Ahn. The Board recommended Formalized Training and the NYPD imposed Formalized Training.

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) rejected mediation.
- § 87(2)(b) [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]
§ 87(2)(b) [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]
- A Notice of Claim inquiry was submitted to the NYC Comptroller's Office on April 9, 2021 and will be added to the case file upon receipt (BR 08).

Squad No.: 6

